DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 067 154 PS 005 793

AUTHOR	Datta, Lois-ellin; And Others
TITLE	A Comparison of a Sample of Full Year and Summer Head Start Programs Operated by Community Action Agencies and Local Education Agencies.
INSTITUTION	Office of Child Development (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Dec 71
NOTE	66p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Child Care Workers; Child Development; *Community Programs; Comparative Analysis; Early Childhood Education; Economic Disadvantagement; Intervention; Parent Participation; *Poverty Programs; *Preschool Education; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Statistical Data; Summer Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Project Head Start

ABSTRACT

Data from a stratified random sample of full-year 1967-1968 and summer 1968 Head Start programs were re-analyzed to compare centers operated by local educational agencies (LEA) and community action agencies (CAA). The analyses indicated that CAA-operated programs were more likely to report parent participation in decision making and as paid staff, while LEA-operated programs were slightly more likely to report parent participation as volunteers; that CAAs had a higher proportion of paraprofessionals and LEAs more professionals; that CAAs recruited individual volunteers from a variety of sources, and LEAs mobilized formal community organization support; that CEAs were more likely to focus on family services and job training. Other findings included data on equipment, impact on children, medical and dental programs, ethnic and economic class of staffs, child eligibility, substantive content of the classrooms, and characterization of programs. The analyses provide a static picture of how program directors, teachers, and parents report some of their experiences. The differences involve structure rather than process of impact, and relatively few statistically reliable differences were, in fact, found between LEA- and CAA-operated programs. (Author/LH)

ED 067154

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A COMPARISON OF A SAMPLE OF FULL YEAR AND SUMMER HEAD START PROGRAMS OPERATED BY COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES AND LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES

by

Lois-ellin Datta, Jane Takeuchi and Barbara Bates

Early Childhood Research Branch

PS 005793

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Child Development

December 1971

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Child Development

A COMPARISON OF THE CHARACTERISTICS OF A SAMPLE OF SUMMER AND FULL-YEAR HEAD START PROGRAMS OPERATED BY LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (LEAs) AND BY COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES (CAAs)

SUMMARY

Data from a stratified random sample of full-year 1967-68 and summer 1968 Head Start programs were re-analyzed to compare Centers operated by LEA and CAA delegate agencies.

The analyses indicated:

- CAA operated programs were more likely to report parent participation in decision-making regarding the program, in personnel selection, and in some aspects of program operation.
- CAA operated programs were more likely to report parent participation as paid staff; LEA operated programs were slightly more likely to report parent participation as volunteers.
- CAA operated programs employed a higher proportion of paraprofessionals; LEA programs employed more professionally trained staff.
- CAA operated programs were more likely to recruit individual volunteers from a variety of sources. LEA operated programs seemed more likely to mobilize formal community organization support.
- CAA operated programs were somewhat more likely to focus on family services and job training, both in terms of programs offered within the Center and in terms of utilization of available community resources.
- LEA operated full-year programs were more likely to have a somewhat greater variety of classroom equipment, to take the children on more trips to cultural and "horizon widening" events, and to report on-site participation by professional or formally trained consultants and staff.
- There were some significant but not substantial differences in impact on the children; such differences as there were indicated slightly greater rates of cognitive development in LEA operated programs and slightly greater rates of social-emotional development in CAA operated programs.
- While medical/dental data should be interpreted cautiously, the children attending CAA operated programs were less likely to have been fully innoculated on entering the program; at the time of the report, their status was not different from that of children attending LEA programs.
- CAA Centers reported slightly greater success in providing medical screening examinations while LEA operated Centers reported slightly greater success in providing follow-up treatment.

PS 005793

- More CAA than LEA staff members were Negro, more resided in the communities they served, and more were poor. LEA staff members reported higher annual family incomes than CAA staff members: more LEA staff members had annual incomes above $10,000 while more CAA staff members reported incomes below $3,000.

- CAA programs were more likely to serve Negro children and less likely to serve other minority group children (e.g., Spanish-speaking) than were LEAs.

- More children attending CAA programs were eligible for Head Start by the poverty guidelines than were children attending LEA programs.

- The substantive content of the classrooms as described by the Center directors indicated greater articulation of educational objectives by LEA operated than by CAA operated programs. This was true across all objectives listed and there was no indication that the LEA operated programs had a proportionately greater emphasis on conceptual and academic development than on social-emotional development.

- The analyses revealed fewer differences in the substantive content of the programs as reported by the Center directors than might be expected. There was little indication that CAA programs were "soft-minded" on curricular input while LEA operated programs were "tough-minded."

- CAA operated programs were characterized by an individually oriented, community-related style in terms of home visits, individual volunteer participation, mode of recruitment, and focus in parent and child programs.

- LEA operated programs were characterized by a style in which more decisions were made by professional staff, with relatively little parent or paraprofessional participation, greater involvement by community organizations and groups, a wider tapping into community channels for getting things done, and a possibly greater articulation of program educational objectives.

- The analyses in general indicated substantial compliance with the program guidelines outlined in the policy manual for both CAA and LEA programs. The divergences seem to be primarily in style and in focus. The CAA programs over a number of indices involve parent participation, utilization of paraprofessionals, and a reaching out to link Head Start to other social service programs in the community. The LEA programs appear to have stronger links to established community organizations, to provide a greater range of professional support, and to depend more on professional and administrative decision-making processes.

The limitations of the re-analyses as an index of LEA/CAA differences include:

- Little independent information on differences in utilization of class resources, and in what might generally be regarded as sound and effective educational practices.
- No information on the impact on the family and the child of parent participation as staff and in decision making.
- No information on the dynamics of LEA and CAA operated programs: for example, on staff development and turnover, and on the attitudes of the staff toward the program, the child and the community throughout the year.
- No information on the impact on the community and the school system of LEA and CAA programs.

The analyses provide a static picture of how program directors, teachers and parents report some of their experiences. The differences noted in the analyses involve structure, rather than process or impact; yet, the structures may provide some indication of what attitudes and activities are likely to develop and might also reveal in what structures have evolved the shaping influence of assumptions, beliefs and attitudes. In this context, the stronger community/parent participation link in the CAAs emerges as a uniting thread throughout the several questionnaires.

It should be clear however that relatively few statistically reliable differences were found between LEA and CAA operated programs. In many points of comparison, LEA and CAA programs appeared to be more marked by similarities than by divergences. The stylistic difference described above emerges across tendencies over many items and some substantial differences rather than from uniformly very large disparities.

Such relatively small differences are in some contexts (e.g., predicting election returns and merchandising) considered evidence of operational significance; in the context of sociological and educational research, larger effects are typically required as a basis for change in theory or policy.

While the findings thus might be considered from a conservative point of view to indicate program convergence, the Census forms were directed toward guidelines specifications: (a) the cost of the "convergence" cannot be assessed in this study and it might be expected that the effort required to comply in some respects was far greater than in others (e.g., perhaps LEAs had to recruit harder for volunteers CAAs attracted readily); (b) response bias in some areas clearly specified by the guidelines (e.g., square feet per child) cannot be ruled out as a source of converging patterns; and (c) the forms were designed to be sensitive to deviations from broadly stated guidelines and are to be insensitive to factors considered by some Head Start staff to most differentiate the nature and effectiveness of LEA and CAA operated programs. In such a situation, the conclusions must necessarily depend on the consequences ascribed to certain organizational patterns.

The data could be interpreted as indicating that by the available criteria there are fewer differences than might have been anticipated for CAA and LEA operated programs, or, given a weighting of some particular aspect (e.g., employment of non-professional staff), the data could appear to indicate differences of considerable programmatic importance.

A COMPARISON OF A SAMPLE OF FULL YEAR AND SUMMER HEAD START PROGRAMS OPERATED BY COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES AND LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES

Lois-ellin Datta, Jane Takeuchi, and Barbara Bates
Head Start Research and Evaluation Section

Head Start is one of many programs supported by the Federal Government whose common goals are alleviation of the suffering due to poverty and the disruption of the poverty cycle. According to the Head Start Policy Manual (1967), "Head Start is a program for the economically disadvantaged child. It is based on the philosophy that a child can benefit most from a comprehensive interdisciplinary attack on his problems at the local level and that the child's entire family, as well as the community, must be involved in solving his problems."

Head Start thus was conceived as a multi-purpose program encompassing child development in the widest sense. The specific objectives of Head Start programs include:

- the child's development as a healthy and vital human being
- the child's development as a warm and decent human being, able to give and receive love, and to trust others and be trusted
- the child's development as a competent, able human being, skilled in ways of coping effectively, who can achieve and enter fully in the richness of a cognitive life with broadened interests and a wide range of styles
- the child's development as a citizen of the pluralistic society of the United States, able if he so chooses, to move freely without the handicaps and barriers imposed by limited language and cognitive styles, be they the narrow style of upper middle class speech patterns or the restricted style of a patois
- the child's and his parent's development as members of a family, of a neighborhood, and of the larger community.

To meet these objectives, Head Start has developed diverse programmatic support and an operational approach that begins with the assumptions of pluralistic needs and the wisdom of the community in seeking ways to identify and meet these needs.

This programmatic support includes at least nine organizational components:

- medical and dental services
- nutrition
- social services
- career development
- teacher and aide training
- community development
- parent participation
- program (classroom) activities
- volunteer participation and mobilization of community resources.

The Head Start Policy Manual used in preparing all grant applications provides guidelines for each of these organizational objectives. Within the common framework of objectives and organization, communities develop the emphases and approaches that are most likely to meet their needs and capitalize on their local resources.

Funds for Head Start programs are awarded by the seven OEO Community Action Program Regional Offices to grantees (or applicant agencies) in their region. A grantee need not necessarily operate the programs. The grantee may provide funds to a delegate agency which then has responsibility for operating all or a substantial part of the total Head Start program. Most Head Start programs are operated by Community Action Agencies (CAAs) or by

Local Education Agencies (LEAs). A Community Action Agency (CAA) is a public or private non-profit organization receiving funds from OEO to develop and administer Community Action Programs in a specified area. Such agencies are organized on a community-wide basis and coordinate a variety of anti-poverty activities. A Local Educational Agency (LEA) is a non-profit organization responsible for public education at the primary or secondary level.

The delegate agency distributions for a random sample of Summer 1968 and Full-Year 1967-68 programs are shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1. DELEGATE AGENCIES OPERATING SAMPLES OF FULL-YEAR 1967-1968 AND SUMMER 1968 HEAD START PROGRAMS

Agency	Full-Year 1967-1968		Summer 1968	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
LEA	262	32	260	59
CAA	338	41	142	33
Private, non-profit	73	9	10	2
Religious related	49	7	2	0
College or University	7	1	2	0
Private School	14	2	2	0
Other	75	9	26	6

A. DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Little information has been available documenting the relative merits of Head Start programs operated through established educational agencies as contrasted to those operated by community action agencies. This report provides a comparison of some characteristics of a sample of programs operated by Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) and Community Action Agencies (CAAs). The studies on which the report is based were designed for a wide survey of trends over Summer and Full-Year programs (Bates, 1969) rather than an in-depth analysis. The re-analysis of data

from these surveys is likely to be insensitive in important ways to potential differences in function and in impact of LEA and CAA Head Start programs. Until studies designed to examine these expected differences are available, however, these interim re-analyses may provide some factual common ground for discussion.

Sample selection: Head Start research and evaluation efforts since Summer 1965 have been characterized by a multi-faceted approach to the task of describing and assessing Head Start. These include support of local evaluation studies, research studies, demonstration projects and pilot studies, large scale research and impact studies, and, for every program period, a national survey of Head Start programs.

This survey is conducted for Head Start by the U.S. Bureau of the Census. The samples of grantees are randomly selected by the Census from a stratification of grantees by program size. The mailing and follow-up are conducted by standard Census procedures. The samples described in this report were of Summer 1968 and Full-Year 1967-68 grantees. Grantees were requested to provide a list of all programs funded by their grants. From this list, a sample of Centers (physical sites) was selected. Every fifth child from all class registers for each site selected became a sample child for the medical and family survey. Data therefore are available for the physical site, rather than for the programs. This primarily affects descriptions of staff availability, as professional specialists are typically employed by programs to provide services at several Centers or sites. Table 2 shows the population and sample sizes. (See Appendix A for details of sampling design.)

TABLE 2. BUREAU OF CENSUS ACTUAL SAMPLE EXPRESSED AS A PERCENT OF OEO TOTAL POPULATIONS FOR SUMMER 1968 AND FULL-YEAR 1967-1968 PROGRAM

	Full-Year 1967-1968			Summer 1968		
	OEO Total	Number Sampled	Percent of Total	OEO Total	Number Sampled	Percent of Total
Grantees	719	280	38.9	1,185	364	30.7
Centers (physical sites)	5,158	945	18.3	9,530	480	5.0
Classes	11,678	2,228	19.1	27,814	2,063	7.4
Staff (estimated)	47,243	9,000	19.1	92,554	9,000	9.7
Children	217,698	7,365	3.4	476,173	6,376	1.3

Survey measures: All measures were questionnaires developed by the Head Start staff in collaboration with the Bureau of the Census. The purpose of the Census study is to provide national data broadly related to Head Start objectives and policy, and such impact information as may be possible. There were six forms mailed to the Summer and Full-Year samples. (See Appendix B for a complete set of forms.)

1. The Staff Member Information form was completed by all paid and volunteer professional, semi-professional, and non-professional staff employed on a regular part-time or full-time basis in the Center.

2. The Center Facilities and Resources Inventory completed by the Center director included information on the paid staff and volunteer participants, on the children served by the Center, on space, transportation and other Center facilities, and on program support and Center operation.

3. The Parent Participation Record - Center Activities form sent to the Coordinator of Parent Activities provided information on parent organizations and participation, parent development programs, and Center activities for parents.

4. In the Parent Participation Record - Class Activities the teacher recorded contacts with the parents and parent participation in the class.

5. In the Medical - Dental Information form the individual responsible for medical services, detailed the medical/dental findings from the examinations of the sample children and the course of treatment, if any.

6. The Family Information Form completed by the parent provided demographic information.

The Bureau of the Census samples and returns for each form are shown in Table 3. The response rates of final usable returns, which ranged from 76% to 95%, are at a level generally considered satisfactory for a mailed questionnaire. While interpretation of survey responses should be made cautiously, the data seem likely to present a reasonably accurate cross section of the Head Start programs for the Summer 1968 and Full-Year 1967-68.

TABLE 3. BUREAU OF CENSUS SAMPLE AND UNWEIGHTED RATES OF RETURN BY SURVEY FORM FOR FULL-YEAR 1967-1968 AND SUMMER 1968 SAMPLES

Form	Full-Year 1967-1968			Summer 1968		
	Number Sampled	Number Returns	Percent of Returns	Number Sampled	Number Returns	Percent o Returns
Center Facilities Inventory	945	837	88.6	480	451	93.9
Parent Record-Center	945	833	88.1	480	453	94.4
Parent Record-Class	2,288	1,993	87.1	2,063	1,901	92.1
Staff Member Information	9,000	8,083	89.8	9,000	8,437	93.7
Family Information Record	7,365	5,563	75.5	6,376	4,952	77.7
Medical/Dental Information	7,365	6,608	89.7	6,376	6,070	95.2

B. FINDINGS

Head Start guidelines offer some criteria for comparison in describing the child, the parents, the programs, the staff, the volunteers and the community.

The Children: According to the guidelines, the children should be of preschool age, and, for the summer programs, children who will be attending kindergarten or elementary school for the first time in fall. The enrollment should furthermore reflect the racial or ethnic composition of the disadvantaged families in the area being served. The recruiters should systematically seek out children from the most disadvantaged homes, using such techniques as door-to-door canvassing, contact through persons who could reasonably be expected to communicate effectively with the parents, and utilization of all available lists of eligible children as leads.

While data are not available on all of these questions, the response by Center Directors indicated:[1]

- Full-year programs recruit younger children than summer programs. Summer and Full-Year CAA programs were more likely to have both older and younger children than were the LEA programs: about 23% of the CAA operated programs as contrasted to 12% of the LEA operated programs, for example, reported some children who were six years old at time of enrollment. In summer, about 32% of the CAA and about 25% of the LEA operated programs enrolled children who were seven years of age or older.

---

1. Detailed frequencies and percents of items from the questionnaires discussed in the text are given in Appendix C.

TABLE 4. PERCENT OF CENTERS REPORTING ONE OR MORE CHILDREN BY CHILD SEX AND AGE AT ENROLLMENT

Reporting Age at Time of Enrollment	Full-Year 1967-1968				Summer 1968			
	LEA		CAA		LEA		CAA	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
3-6 to 3-11	40%	39%	44%	44%	4%	6%	9%	6%
4-0 to 4-5	63	62	64	61	13	12	20	14
4-6 to 4-11	66	65	71	69	44	45	47	50
5-0 to 5-5	50	45	64	60	57	54	60	61
5-6 to 5-11	33	31	52	49	84	82	80	80
6-0 to 6-11	14	10	24	23	70	69	77	74
7-0 or older	3	1	3	2	27	29	35	28

- About 40% of all programs reported that at least one or more Negro and one or more white children enrolled; Full-Year and Summer LEA programs were more likely to report Mexican-American enrollees while CAA programs were more likely to report Negro enrollees. As Table 5 suggests, LEA programs are more likely than CAA programs to serve diverse minority groups. There are, however, no data relating recruitment to neighborhood ethnic mix, and the distributions may indicate that CAA programs are more likely to operate in uni-ethnic areas than are LEA programs.

TABLE 5. ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF CHILDREN ATTENDING LEA AND CAA OPERATED SAMPLE PROGRAMS

	Full-Year 1967-1968		Summer 1968	
	LEA	CAA	LEA	CAA
Mexican American	17%	5%	18%	4%
Puerto Rican	0	1	0	0
White	34	25	27	34
Negro	34	58	38	54
American Indian	1	3	1	1
All other	1	2	0	2
No response	11	5	0	3

- The programs have used a wide variety of approaches to recruiting children: teachers, volunteers, door-to-door canvass, welfare rolls, school lists,

TV and radio announcements, and even with this list, "other." All four program groups reported using many different media; however, there were some differences between CAA and LEA programs (particularly Full-Year programs) in reliance on individual as contrasted to institutional recruitment techniques. LEA operated programs were more likely to rely on teachers, on school lists, on TV and radio announcements, and on brochures and letters. CAA operated programs were more likely to rely on door-to-door canvassing.

Family Background: Over half of the children came from homes with a nuclear family pattern of father (natural father, foster father or father surrogate), mother, and sibs. While there was little mother-absence, 26% of all sample children attending the Summer 1968 programs and 32% of those attending Full-Year 1967-68 programs came from father-absent homes. Almost all the fathers who were present were likely to be employed, and the majority were likely to have been employed for the previous 12 months. About 40% of the fathers were employed as unskilled laborers, about 23% were semi-skilled workers, about 20% were craftsmen, and the remaining 13% who reported an occupation were distributed evenly among white collar jobs from professional and technical work (2%) to sales (2%). The fathers of the children attending CAA as contrasted to LEA Full-Year 1967-68 programs were more likely to be employed as laborers (51% vs 42%), and to have dropped out of school after the 8th grade (36% vs 45%). For the Full-Year and Summer samples, mothers of children attending CAA as contrasted to LEA programs were more likely to have been employed (35% vs 26%); the employed CAA mothers also were more likely (49% vs 33%) to have worked for 12 months during the past year. For the Full-Year programs, mothers of children attending CAA programs were more likely to have dropped out

after the 8th grade (23% vs 29%); for the Summer programs, however, the LEA mothers were more likely to have completed only the 8th grade or less (32% vs 27%).

Almost all the children had siblings living at home; the median family had four children in the home, including the Head Start child. Although the family size distributions were not reliably different for CAA and LEA Summer and Full-Year samples, the total income of the Full-Year CAA sample was reliably lower than that of the other three samples: 60% had incomes below $3,499 as contrasted to 51% of the Full-Year LEA families.

Eligibility: The guidelines indicate that at least 90% of the children to be enrolled in each class must be eligible under the "poverty line" index established by Head Start. The index provides total income maximums by family size for farm and non-farm families. The family size of each family information form respondant was estimated by adding siblings, mother (if present) and father (if present) plus "1" for the Head Start child. Few families indicated other relatives or non-relatives, adults or children, were living in the home. The omission of these from the total family size may result, however, in some underestimation of eligibility. A second source of underestimation is the likelihood that the families which did not return the questionnaire were most in need.
The data should therefore be regarded as estimates providing some comparison of the poverty level of families served by LEA and CAA operated Head Starts. The average per capita income was below the guidelines for the median family size for farm and non-farm families for CAA operated Summer and Full-Year programs. The average per capita income was somewhat above the guidelines for the median family size for farm families for Summer and

Full-Year LEA operated programs and for the summer non-farm families.

- Overall, the CAA operated programs had a higher percent of families returning the questionnaire who were eligible by the guidelines than did the LEA operated programs. The CAA programs appear to be recruiting children from substantially poorer families than do the LEA programs, even with the greater proportion of rural (farm) families taken into account.

The Full-Year LEA sample families were, however, more likely to receive welfare payments (32% vs 25%) and to live in urban areas (86% vs 72%). This might suggest that to some extent welfare payments supplemented the family's own earnings to a sufficient extent to raise the incomes of the LEA families to somewhat above those of the CAA families. The relationships among father absence, urban residence, welfare and per capita income would require more extensive analysis to identify reliably the source of the LEA/CAA differences in apparent standard of living.

The Full-Year LEA sample, possibly reflecting to some extent the urban residence, was more likely than were the other samples to report the presence of some indicators of a desirable standard of living while the Full-Year CAA sample, in all of six comparisons, was the lowest of the four sample programs: e.g., running water inside (LEA, 95% vs CAA, 79%), use of telephone (LEA, 65% vs CAA, 49%), ownership of a TV set (LEA, 94% vs CAA, 90%), and receives daily newspaper (LEA, 73% vs CAA, 63%). These data suggest a greater economic disparity than the 7% rural-urban difference might account for between the families of children who

attended LEA and CAA operated Full-Year 1967-68 programs. Families of children enrolled in the CAA programs were substantially more economically disadvantaged than were those of children enrolled in LEA programs: the fathers and mothers were more likely to have an 8th grade education or less, the mothers were far more likely to be working: the income was more likely to be lower, and the family was less likely to report possession of some material goods. This distinction is in some ways, however, between the poor and the poorer.

Reliable CAA/LEA differences (as tested by two-tailed Chi-square, $p \leq .05$) were found most frequently for Full-Year programs. The CAA/LEA differences were smaller and less reliable. With the exception of mothers' education, the Summer trends are, however, consistent with those of the Full-Year LEA/CAA analyses.

About 40% of the sample children had siblings with previous Head Start experience; this suggests that some families become "Head Start" families. Little is known about the cumulative impact on the family of participation in Head Start over a period of several years; the finding that so substantial a proportion have had this experience might suggest the value of investigating this pattern. The data also raise the possibility that even if the sample child is "Head Start new," the baseline data on this child may be substantially higher than if the child and his family had not had previous contact with the program. This within-family diffusion might affect a variety of measures, and might represent a factor of substantial methodological importance in studies of the impact of Head Start. To date, no study of Head Start has investigated this possible effect for any variable.

Parent Participation: According to the guidelines, "Every Head Start program must have effective parent participation." Four major kinds of participation are described:

- in making decisions about the nature and operation of the program
- in the classroom as paid employees, volunteers or observers
- in discussions in their home with Center staff about ways in which the parents can contribute to the child's development
- educational activities for the parents which they have helped to develop.

Parent participation is considered so basic that as policy, every Head Start program is required to designate a coordinator of parent activities. Considerable attention is also given to the general structure and composition (a minimum of 50% parents) of policy advisory groups, the formal means of involving parents in decision making.

Participation in Decision-Making: The majority of programs reported a Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) in the Center; however, as Table 6 shows, CAA operated Centers were more likely to report such Committees, particularly for the Full-Year Programs. Almost all of the Centers which did not have on-site PACs reported parent representation on other (presumably program-level) PACs; the Summer LEA programs were slightly more likely not to provide some parent representation on a PAC alternative. Most parents for whom information was available were elected rather than appointed to PACs; the percent of known elected members was higher for Full-Year (about 78%) than for Summer (about 60%) programs. Over half of the programs reported on-site Center-wide Parent

TABLE 6. PERCENT OF SAMPLE CENTERS WITH ON-SITE PARENT ADVISORY COMMITTEES OR PARENT REPRESENTATION ON A PARENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

	Full-Year 1967-1968		Summer 1968	
	LEA	CAA	LEA	CAA
1. PAC in Center?	49%	63%	65%	70%
2. If no, is there Parent representation on other PAC?	89	82	66	80
3. Of known Centers, are Parents elected as members?	77	81	59	59
4. Center-wide Parent Group Committee?	69	67	50	60
5. Class-Parent Group Committees?	41	36	27	29

Group Committees (PGCs).[1] For the Full-Year programs, there were no reliable LEA/CAA differences in percent reporting Center-wide Parent Committees. Class-parent Committees were least likely to be reported (they were cited by about 38% Full-Year and 28% Summer programs); there were no reliable LEA/CAA differences in these percents.

In summary, the PAC appears to be the predominant formal organization within the Head Start program for parent participation; virtually all programs offered within site or within program representation. While CAA/LEA differences were not reliable across the board, in all of

1. PACs provide program-wide parent representation in policy and advisory positions. Class parent committees offer the opportunity for parental representation and participation in situations of direct concern to their own children. Where several classes are located in one physical site (Center), the formation of Center-wide Parent Group Committees is encouraged for parent participation at intermediate, but still directly meaningful organizational level. All programs must have PACs and all classes should have class parent committees. Center Parent Group Committees develop more flexibly in response to locally significant situations.

the three instances in which one of the four samples reported an unusually low percent of PAC, the program was LEA operated.

Concerning the role of the PACs in decision-making regarding the program, as Table 7 indicates, staff selection, preparation and approval of the program proposal and determining the scope of the parent programs were activities for which about 50% of all sample Centers reported PAC participation. For the Full-Year programs, the CAA PACs appear to have had a greater role in selection of paid professional and non-professional staff and project administration than did the LEA PACs, while the LEA PACs had a relatively greater role in program planning. For the Summer programs, in all of the eight comparisons, more CAA operated than LEA operated programs tended to report PAC participation in decision-making. However, except for selection of paid professional staff, the summer differences were not reliable.

TABLE 7. PERCENT OF "YES" RESPONSES REGARDING POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING

	Full-Year 1967-1968		Summer 1968	
	LEA	CAA	LEA	CAA
Does Policy Advisory Committee aid in:				
1. Selection of				
Paid Professional Staff?	28%	45%	39%	61%
Non-professional Staff?	38	52	46	57
Consultants?	26	26	25	34
2. Project Administration				
Leave and Time Regulations?	13	24	21	26
Budget Preparation and Review?	36	42	30	37
3. Program Planning				
Program Proposal?	59	52	62	64
Supervise Daily Child Program?	18	17	19	24
Parent Programs?	68	58	59	67

The role of the parents, the CAPs, and the educational establishment in selecting pivotal staff is further detailed in the Center Facilities form. As Table 8 shows, the local school board and the Board of Education participate in teacher selection for a substantial proportion of LEA operated programs but for very few CAA programs. The Parent Advisory Group and the CAP personnel director participate in teacher selection for 25% to 50% of the CAA programs as contrasted to 4% to 27% of the LEA programs.

TABLE 8. PERCENT OF CENTERS INDICATING SOME PARTICIPATION IN TEACHER SELECTION BY "EDUCATIONAL ESTABLISHMENT" AND "COMMUNITY ACTION" GROUPS

	Full-Year 1967-1968		Summer 1968	
	LEA	CAA	LEA	CAA
Center Director	39%	35%	46%	41%
Parents Advisory Council	17	43	27	49
CAP Personnel Director	4	24	5	25
Local School Board	30	5	27	13
Education Director	23	13	21	17
Board of Education	50	7	38	15

Sponsorship of Parent Development Programs: Sponsorship of parent development programs ("initiation") was expected to provide some index of the extent of parent directed activity which the three parent groups and the Center staffs helped to develop. The value of the LEA-CAA comparisons on this item is limited because of the high frequency of "none at all" responses. There were 22 potential categories of activities. For slightly more than half of these categories for the Full-Year programs and about two-thirds of these categories for the Summer programs, 85% or more of the sample Centers reported "none at all." In about 90% of these "none at all" comparisons, 85% or more of the Center staffs also initiated "none at all." Some of these low frequency activities would seem relatively peripheral (e.g., children's literature, home decorating and repairs, clothing, gardening and carpentry) while others might seem more central to the children's and parents' lives (e.g., speech and language development, household management, fiscal management, consumer education and employment information). In addition to these silent areas, the Summer programs were also unlikely to offer meetings or programs directed to consumer education, clothing, employment activities and current civic events.

There were no reliable LEA-CAA differences in activity level sponsorship by any of the three parent groups, althougn for Full-Year programs, slightly greater parent initiation of development programs was reported by LEA operated Centers while for Summer programs, slightly greater parent initiation of activity was reported by CAA operated Centers.

TABLE 9. PERCENT OF 22 ACTIVITIES INITIATED IN MORE THAN 15% OF THE CENTERS BY GROUPS WHICH COULD POTENTIALLY HAVE INITIATED ACTIVITIES FOR CAA & LEA OPERATED PROGRAMS

Group	Full-Year 1967-1968		Summer 1968	
	LEA	CAA	LEA	CAA
Policy Advisory Committee	48%	44%	44%	51%
Center Parent Group Committee	53	49	39	48
Class Parent Group Committee	23	23	19	15
Center staff	47	41	48	45

A comparison of the initiation levels of the four groups indicates that, according to the Center Directors, slightly more activities were initiated by Center Parent Group Committees and by the Center staff than by the Policy Advisory Committee except for the Summer CAAs. (See Table 9.) What activities did these two groups support?

For both groups in all four samples, parent development activities most likely to be initiated involved child growth and development, health education, social (recreation), nutrition, and classroom observation. There were no reliable LEA/CAA differences in Center Parent Group initiation for the full-year programs. LEA sponsored programs tended however to report more parent initiation of child development workshops, classroom observations, health education and family planning programs, while CAAs were slightly more likely to report initiation of fund-raising activities. For the sample of Summer Head Starts CAA-operated programs were slightly more likely than LEA-operated programs to report some activity sponsored by Center Parent Group Committees. CAA Center Parent Groups tended to report initiation of at least one structured classroom observation program and social event.

Considering the relative amount of time available, the Full-Year—Summer differences were not as great as might be expected, except for the high activity rate of the Summer CAA program staffs. There were no reliable

differences for the Full-Year programs between rates of initiation for CAA and LEA staffs. For the Summer programs, in ten out of 13 comparisons, the CAA staffs were reported more likely to initiate a given activity than were the LEA program staffs.

TABLE 10. PARENT AND STAFF INITIATION OF SELECTED PARENT DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES[1]

	Full-Year 1967-1968				Summer 1968			
	Center PGC		Staff		Center PGC		Staff	
	LEA	CAA	LEA	CAA	LEA	CAA	LEA	CAA
1. Child Development	35%	29%	43%	45%	26%	27%	41%	50%
2. Classroom Observation	20	13	29	26	15	23	20	35
3. Children's Literature	9	8	14	16	5	10	13	20
4. Health Education	29	24	32	33	26	24	30	43
5. Family Planning	19	15	18	15	16	12	11	16
6. Language Development	11	7	22	21	10	8	15	22
11. Nutrition	22	23	27	28	25	21	29	32
12. Clothing	18	21	15	15	14	11	9	7
15. Employment	16	12	14	14	4	10	6	9
17. Community Resources	21	19	21	21	14	18	19	23
B. Social Events	31	30	26	29	19	26	25	31
C. Fund Raising	17	22	5	11	2	5	1	3
D. Policy and Program Planning	9	10	20	21	13	15	15	29

1. 15% or more Centers indicating one or more meetings.

As Table 10 shows, the activities the staff personnel were likely to initiate were child growth and development programs and health education programs. The Summer CAA staffs were, in addition, more likely to initiate activities in children's literature, family life and planning, speech and language development, and Center policy and curriculum planning.

In summary, it would seem as if the agency operating the Head Start program had little effect in shaping parent choice of activities. Center PGCs tended to initiate programs in child development, health education, social events and nutrition. The rate of staff initiated programs was higher for CAA

than for LEA Summer programs, but for the Full-Year programs, there were relatively few differences. The content of the staff-sponsored activity in both Full-Year and Summer programs closely resembled the distributions for the Center PGC's. The LEA/CAA differences may appear less compelling on inspection of the tables than the overall similarities. On the other hand, the questionnaire may permit us to see through a glass darkly greater differences in the role of parents and staff in CAA and LEA operated Head Starts.

Training Programs for Parents: Few of the sample Centers provided courses such as literacy and vocational training. Pre-service and in-service training for parents were reported by about 22% of the Centers. There were no reliable CAA/LEA differences.

TABLE 11. PERCENT OF CENTERS OFFERING TRAINING COURSES AND COUNSELING TO PARENTS

	Full-Year 1967-1968		Summer 1968	
	LEA	CAA	LEA	CAA
Training Courses				
1. Literacy	13%	11%	4%	4%
2. Vocational	8	5	3	3
3. Pre-service	20	16	22	24
4. In-service	26	23	22	21
Counseling (contact with one or more families)				
1. Educational/Vocational	38	30	26	24
2. Family Counseling and Referrals	58	42	38	40
3. Social Service and Referrals	58	53	53	46

Parent Counseling: Parent counseling on educational, vocational, personal and social service problems was reported by about 30% of the Centers. As Table 11 indicates, Full-Year programs were slightly more likely than the Summer programs to offer these services. In all of the three comparisons for the Full-Year sample, LEA operated programs were somewhat more likely to

report some parent service: educational counseling was offered by 38% of the LEA-operated programs as contrasted to 30% of the CAA programs, family counseling by 58% of the LEA-operated programs as contrasted to 42% of the CAA programs and social service counseling by 58% of the LEA-operated programs as contrasted with 53% of the CAA-operated programs. The differences although continuing to indicate greater LEA service were less marked in the Summer programs.

Parent Paid and Volunteer Participation: The number of Centers reporting that one or more parents served as staff members in a variety of positions, both paid and volunteer, may provide some index of both parent involvement and Center outreach. Considering first volunteers, as Table 12 indicates, virtually no Center reported any parents serving as full-time volunteers in any capacity. Parents were most likely to volunteer as

TABLE 12. PERCENT OF CENTERS REPORTING SOME PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT ON VOLUNTEER STAFF[1]

Position	Full-Year 1967-1968				Summer 1968			
	Full-Time		Part-Time		Full-Time		Part-Time	
	LEA	CAA	LEA	CAA	LEA	CAA	LEA	CAA
1. Teacher Aide	8%	10%	43%	41%	10%	12%	41%	31%
2. Health Aide	2	1	8	5	2	2	10	11
3. Social Service Aide	2	1	7	5	2	2	8	5
4. Nutrition Aide	1	0	6	6	1	2	7	6
5. Cook	2	2	7	13	3	5	8	13
6. Bus Driver	3	3	11	9	4	1	8	10
7. Trip Aide	2	3	29	33	6	7	34	35
8. Equipment Maintenance	0	1	14	18	0	1	6	10
9. Clerical	0	1	4	6	1	0	7	4
10. Custodial	1	0	3	3	0	1	3	1
11. Launderer	1	0	4	11	0	0	2	1
12. Babysitter	0	1	1	3	1	1	9	9

1. In 1966-67, about 26% of all paid staff members were Head Start parents. The percents reported here are for Centers reporting one or more parents participating in a given capacity.

part-time teacher aides and as transportation and trip aides. For the Summer programs, LEA Centers reported a somewhat higher proportion than CAA Centers of some parents serving as volunteer part-time teacher aides (41% vs 31%); the differences on the other 12 staff categories were slight. For the Full-Year samples, the CAA Centers were somewhat more likely than LEA Centers to report some parents serving (part-time) as cooks, as transportation and trip aides, and as launderers.

As Table 13 shows, Centers were more likely to report some paid full-time employment of parents as teacher aides than any other category. There were no reliable differences in parent employment for the Full-Year or Summer programs between CAA and LEA operated Head Starts, although for

TABLE 13. PERCENT OF CENTERS REPORTING SOME PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT AS PAID STAFF[1]

	Full-Year 1967-1968				Summer 1968			
	Full-Time		Part-Time		Full-Time		Part-Time	
Position	LEA	CAA	LEA	CAA	LEA	CAA	LEA	CAA
Teacher Aide	33%	40%	16%	18%	48%	51%	8%	10%
Health Aide	4	4	4	3	8	5	2	5
Social Service Aide	9	11	5	5	13	11	3	5
Nutrition Aide	2	4	0	2	4	10	3	2
Cook: Food Preparation	6	14	5	10	12	13	5	7
Bus Driver	4	3	5	7	13	14	4	5
Equipment Maintenance	3	4	3	4	5	2	2	5
Clerical	0	2	4	3	4	5	2	2
Custodial	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	2
Launderer	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Babysitter	1	3	0	1	0	0	0	2

1. Centers indicating one or more parents employed in a given position.

the Full-Year programs, CAA operated Centers were somewhat more likely to employ Head Start parents as full-time teacher aides and as cooks.

Home Visits: Virtually all of the Full-Year and Summer CAA and LEA programs reported that teachers made some home visits. Teacher aides, social workers, social worker aides were also likely to have made home visits. For

the Full-Year Head Starts, more CAA operated programs reported teachers made home visits while more LEA operated programs reported social workers made home visits (61% vs 48%). All other differences were not reliable.

The reported average number of visits per family per month tended to be higher for CAA than for LEA operated programs: 54% of the CAA Full-Year programs reported an average of twice a month or more often vs 44% for LEAs, and 54% of the CAA Summer programs reported an average of two or more visits per family per month vs 46% for LEAs. Since the CAA parents were more likely to live in rural areas, which might be expected to be less accessible in some ways than urban areas, this may suggest greater effort with regards to in-the-home contact by CAA operated programs.

Parent-Teacher Classroom Contacts: The data in the previous sections were reported by Parent Coordinators or by Center Directors. Classroom teachers also were asked to record parent-teacher activities. As Table 14 indicates, virtually all teachers reported one or more consultations initiated by the teacher at the parents' home.

TABLE 14. CONSULTATIONS ABOUT INDIVIDUAL CHILDREN INITIATED BY PARENTS AND TEACHERS

		Percent of Classes Reporting One or More Contacts			
		Full-Year 1967-1968		Summer 1968	
Initiator	Locale	LEA	CAA	LEA	CAA
Teacher	Home	77%	83%	79%	91%
Teacher	Center	83	76	74	65
Parent	Home	36	35	25	27
Parent	Center	72	69	67	66

Most at-home conferences were teacher initiated; at-center consultations were more likely to be parent initiated than at-home conferences, which may underscore the importance of parent visits to the Center as an

opportunity for parent initiation of conferences regarding children. CAA Centers, both for Summer and Full-Year programs, were more likely than LEA programs to report one or more teacher initiated consultations at the parents' home; LEA Centers were more likely than CAA operated Centers to report teacher initiated consultations at the Center.

There were no reliable CAA/LEA differences in the number of teachers reporting no contacts with individual families: 18% of Full-Year and 13% of Summer teachers reported no contacts.

Most teachers reported that parents—both fathers and mothers--participated at least occasionally in the classroom activities. Participation was reported higher for Full-Year than for Summer programs, and for mothers than for fathers. LEA operated programs, both Summer ard Full-Year, were more likely to report that one or more parents were "frequently active." This may reflect the greater number of LEA urban families, and the smaller number of LEA working mothers and parents employed as teacher aides; it could be a so interpreted to indicate greater success on the part of LEA programs in developing attitudes fostering parent involvement in the classroom. Further analyses would be needed to check out the variance due to the first three possibilities.

Of the alternatives listed, bringing the child to and from school appeared to be the most regular contact between the school and the family (particularly the mother) with "staying to watch or help in class," and "going with the child on medical or dental visits" the next most frequent activities.

Most teachers indicated that the principal reasons for nonparticipation of parents were work during class hours (91%) and lack of babysitters for small children in the home (87%). Lack of transportation was the third most

frequently given reason, affecting Summer parents more than Full-Year parents and CAA parents more than LEA parents. Lack of interest was cited by about 45% of the Full-Year teachers and 35% of the Summer teachers.

Staffing Patterns: According to the guidelines, Head Start programs must adopt personnel policies which will guarantee employment of qualified personnel, foster opportunities for employment of non-professionals, establish career development systems including adequate training, provide a sound system of compensation, provide objective review of staff grievances, and stress the use of volunteers in meaningful roles. Staff qualification requirements should allow maximum flexibility for stressing abilities, achievements and potential as well as formal training. The Policy Manual furthermore provides recommendations of minimum staffing patterns considered necessary to support the full comprehensive program, and describe the qualifications and duties of each position.

Data are not available on all of these criteria, nor can one tell from the response by Center (site) directors and staff members whether or not the services required are generally provided by all programs. On-site responsibility of day-to-day operation appears to rest on the teachers and teacher aides. This may be partly due to the fact that the majority of "centers" sampled had only one or two classes, and thus "centers" might be expected to share professional personnel at the program level to provide psychological, medical, nutritional, and social worker services. This is, however, an inference, as no direct information is available on program level staff or services available on-site through shared personnel.

- Center directors listed the number of full-time or part-time staff members involved with Center activities. Most Centers had at least one or more

administrators, teachers, nurses, social workers and physicians involved on a sufficiently regular basis to be reported as staff for that Center. Few of the Centers reported one or more staff members who were psychologists, speech therapists, physicians, dentists, nutritionists or consultants. In general, the Summer programs were more likely than Full-Year Centers to report professional staff availability. LEA/CAA differences were few for the Summer programs and more pronounced for the Full-Year programs: CAA operated Head Starts were less likely to report administrators (69% vs 78%), teachers with "degrees," nurses, social workers, psychologists, counselors, speech therapists and nutritionists. Since the CAA centers were not less likely to report that the functions were the designated responsibility of some staff member, one interpretation may be that the CAA operated Centers are more likely to use personnel in "professional" roles who do not have the specific college or professional training for the positions they hold. On the one hand, this could indicate greater flexibility for the Full-Year CAAs than for the other three program groups; on the other hand, there is no evidence regarding the qualifications for the positions or the factors which might have influenced this decision—availability and interest of qualified personnel, differential emphases on personal as contrasted with academic qualifications, or a systematic hiring policy that favored diversity of formal backgrounds.

- As might be expected, the CAA operated programs, both Summer and Full-Year, were more likely to report one or more non-professional staff members such as social service aides (54% vs 48%) and cooks (54% vs 50%). The non-professional staff patterns may reflect the much greater likelihood of LEA operated programs to be housed in schools and to use school facilities (and presumably personnel) for such program components as nutrition (LEAs tend

to use school cafeterias) and transportation (LEAs use school buses). While utilization of available resources is encouraged, the guidelines also suggest that where feasible, employment opportunities be created for low-income personnel.

The Staff Members: While no data are available on the exact number of Full-Year and Summer staff members, those most likely to have returned the questionnaire may have been the staff members present at Centers (sites) on a regular basis, as the forms were sent directly to the Center Directors, not to Program Directors, or delegate agencies. Thus, the data may reflect more accurately the staffing patterns at the Centers themselves, rather than personnel and services shared among sites at the program level. A Center is defined as a physical location, or site, having one or more Head Start classes. Though the range of classes per Center for the four samples was from one class to more than 30 classes, most Centers tended to be small: two classes per Center for Full-Year LEA and CAA programs, and four classes per Center for Summer LEA and CAA programs.

Staff Member Status Within Programs: There were statistically reliable differences between LEA and CAA Full-Year programs in overall distribution of staff members. LEAs tended to employ more professionals, while CAAs reported a greater concentration of personnel in semi- and non-professional positions. According to the Policy Manual, two-thirds of Head Start positions can be filled by non-professionals. By this criterion, the Full-Year LEA programs were about 10% overstaffed with professionals.

TABLE 15. PERCENT OF STAFF MEMBERS IN PROFESSIONAL, SEMI-PROFESSIONAL, AND NON-PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS

	Full-Year 1967-1968		Summer 1968	
	LEA	CAA	LEA	CAA
Professional	43%	34%	38%	38%
Semi-Professional	37	35	34	31
Non-Professional	17	28	26	30

Within the professional category, there was a small but significant difference between Full-Year LEA and CAA programs in the overall distribution of staff members in the Educational/Psychological/Social sphere. LEAs had a greater concentration of administrators and teachers than did CAAs. In addition, the ratio of administrators to teachers was higher for LEA than for CAA Full-Year programs: one to four or five vs one to six. Within the semi-professional category in Full-Year programs, CAAs reported significantly more teacher aides than did LEAs (80% vs 71%); in Summer programs, the difference was smaller.

A breakdown of the non-professional category indicates that CAAs had significantly more cooks/chauffeurs/maintenance workers than did LEAs in both Full-Year programs (54% vs 42%), and Summer programs (42% vs 35%). LEAs, in contrast, had a significantly higher proportion of secretaries/clerks than did CAAs in Full-Year programs (16% vs 6%); in Summer the difference (8% vs 5%) was not significant. LEA programs tend on the whole to report relatively more administrative personnel in both professional and non-professional positions, while CAA programs tend to report more "direct service" personnel.

Staffing Patterns at Centers: No specific information as to the distribution of staff members relative to children and families served is available at the program level. The Policy Manual guidelines (which are quite flexible) indicating maximum and minimum numbers of staff members per total number of children are at the program level. Many types of staff members are not required to be present at Centers (on site), but rather to provide their services to the target community on a regular basis, at the program level.

The two staff members whose presence on site was required on a day-to-day basis are the teacher and teacher aide. The data do not indicate, however, that one teacher was employed for each class in 100% of the Centers. It is impossible to determine whether this reflects reporting errors, double sessions (two classrooms) handled by one teacher, or actual teacher shortages. By this criterion, classes also appeared to be understaffed in terms of teacher aides. Though the Policy Manual specifies that each class should have one paid and one volunteer teacher aide, staff data forms returned for both LEA and CAA programs yielded an average of only one teacher aide per class. It is possible that some staff members who reported themselves as "other" semi- or non-professional personnel functioned in fact as teacher aides, or that some teacher aides served more than one class or were present on less than a daily basis.

Virtually no other types of professional or semi-professional staff members were reported present on a per class or per Center basis. Though LEA programs were slightly better staffed with professional Educational/Psychological/Social personnel than were CAAs, the only

specialists (outside of teachers) present at 20% or more of the Centers in both Full-Year and Summer LEA and CAA programs were administrators and social workers.

TABLE 16. PERCENT OF CENTERS REPORTING ONE OR MORE ADMINISTRATORS, SOCIAL WORKERS, AND SOCIAL SERVICE AIDES

	Full-Year 1967-1968		Summer 1968*	
	LEA	CAA	LEA	CAA
Administrators	45%	31%	78%	72%
Social Workers	26	21	52	59
Social Service Aides	3.	33	51	62

*The higher percentages in summer may reflect the larger size of Summer Centers.

The distribution of semi-professional educational/psychological/social personnel (other than teacher aides) by Center indicates that CAAs had somewhat more social service aides than did LEAs (33% vs 30% in Full-Year, and 62% vs 51% in Summer programs). This finding may be of some importance, because it is unlikely that social service aides were shared among Centers.

A per Center distribution of professional and semi-professional Medical/Dental staff members may not yield a reliable picture of actual services rendered, because it is likely that total Medical/Dental services were contracted out by some programs. With the exception of nurses, no types of Medical/Dental personnel were reported at more than 10% of Full-Year, or 20% of Summer, Centers.

In the case of the non-professional staff, both Full-Year and Summer CAA programs and Summer LEA programs averaged more than one cook,

chauffeur or maintenance worker per Center. At least one secretary or clerk was present at 15-37% of all Centers.

Function of Staff Members as Directors or Coordinators: The Policy Manual specifies that at the program level, additional or regular staff members are to serve as directors of the Child Development Program, Education Program, Medical (and Dental) Services, Nursing, Nutrition, Psychological Services, and Career Development and Training, and as coordinators of Volunteers and of Parent Activities. It was not expected that each function would necessarily be carried out by a different individual or on a full-time basis, but rather that some staff member would be designated to perform each function.

TABLE 17. PERCENT OF CENTERS REPORTING STAFF MEMBERS FUNCTIONING AS DIRECTORS AND COORDINATORS

	Full-Year 1967-1968		Summer 1967*	
	LEA	CAA	LEA	CAA
Directors of				
Child Development Program	82%	100%	100%	100%
Education Program	100	86	100	100
Medical Services	24	24	43	47
Dental Services	17	18	34	34
Social Services	30	36	70	55
Nursing	15	14	33	30
Psychological Services	16	10	27	21
Nutrition	27	37	53	53
Career Development & Training	26	20	25	11
Other	51	64	96	100
Coordinator of				
Volunteers	58	63	85	100
Parent Activities	73	86	94	100
Other	33	36	51	80

*Here again, percentages may be higher in Summer programs because of the larger size of Summer programs.

As Table 17 shows, the only functions performed at more than 50% of all Centers are Director of the Child Development Program and the Education Program, and Coordinator of Volunteers and of Parent Activities. For the Full-Year programs, CAA operated Centers reported significantly more on-site staff members serving as director of the Child Development program, of the Nutrition program, of "Other" programs, and as coordinator of Parent Activities. Full-Year LEA programs reported significantly more directors of the Education program and of Psychological Services at Centers. For Summer Head Start, significantly more LEA Centers had a director of Career Development and Training, while more CAA Centers had a director of "Other" programs, and coordinators of Volunteers, Parent Activities, and of "Other" programs.

Educational Bankground: In Full-Year but not in Summer programs, LEA staff members had had more formal schooling and had attained higher levels or degrees than CAA staff members.

TABLE 18. HIGHEST LEVEL OF FORMAL SCHOOLING COMPLETED AND HIGHEST DEGREE RECEIVED BY STAFF MEMBERS: PERCENT OF SAMPLE REPORTING EACH LEVEL

	Full-Year 1967-1968		Summer 1968	
	LEA	CAA	LEA	CAA
Highest Level Attended				
None or Elementary (grades 1-8)	7%	15%	16%	19%
High School (grades 9-12)	38	48	36	36
College or more	53	35	44	41
Highest Degree Received				
Elementary (grade 8)	15%	26%	23%	22%
High School	41	47	28	29
Bachelor's or other degree	42	22	40	37

For Full-Year programs, 43% of the LEA staff, as compared with 24% of the CAA staff, had completed Bachelor's or higher degrees. Since 45% of the Full-Year LEA staff and 34% of the Full-Year CAA staff themselves as professional personnel, roughly 2% of LEA and 10% of CAA Full-Year staff members seem to have filled professional positions for which they were not formally trained.

The fact that more LEAs than CAAs had formally trained personnel in professional positions does not necessarily mean that CAAs provided low quality programs or deviated from the intent of Head Start staff policy. The Policy Manual states, "OEO does not require completion of degrees or certificates as a condition of professional employment," and "Nearly two-thirds of the jobs in Head Start programs are potentially available for non-professionals." However, the Manual also states that ". . . unusual circumstances or need should not be used to condone hiring of lesser qualified persons when better candidates are available." Since the percentage of professional personnel (especially teachers) required to meet certification specifications varies from one jurisdiction to another, the quality of staff employed by CAA and LEA programs cannot be meaningfully evaluated without more data on specific hiring practices, local conditions, and other factors relative to employment standards as well as information on staff effectiveness by several different criteria within the program. On the whole, the available data indicate that LEA programs were more likely to be staffed with persons having higher degrees, while CAA staff were more likely to have been selected for other reasons.

Prior Training of Professional and Semi-Professional Educational/Psychological/Social Personnel: A significantly higher proportion of the Full-Year LEA Educational/Psychological/Social staff (55% vs 37% for CAAs) had taken degree-oriented education or home economics courses at a college or university. In Summer the difference was not significant (53% vs 51%). The specific undergraduate training of staff for whom the question was relevant was not reliably different, however, for LEA and CAA programs.

TABLE 19. MAJOR FIELD* AND PRACTICE TEACHING EXPERIENCE OF PROFESSIONAL AND SEMI-PROFESSIONAL EDUCATIONAL/PSYCHOLOGICAL/SOCIAL PERSONNEL IN ORDER OF DESIRABILITY ACCORDING TO THE POLICY MANUAL

	Full-Year 1967-1968		Summer 1968	
	LEA	CAA	LEA	CAA
Major in ECD or education; practice teaching with preschoolers	33%	35%	24%	26%
Major in ECD or Elementary Ed; no practice teaching with preschoolers	43	40	56	51
Major in Home Ec., Secondary Ed., or other Ed.; no practice teaching with preschoolers	24	25	19	23

*Not necessarily a Bachelor's degree.

The Manual indicates that a major in early child development (ECD) with supervised preschool practice teaching experience is the most desirable preparation for Head Start teachers. In this instance, the failure to find significant LEA/CAA differences despite other staffing pattern divergences may suggest that if the formally trained personnel are hired at all, the sample CAAs and LEAs were equally able to attract well qualified staff and equally likely to select the best among what personnel were available.

Age: The median staff member in both LEA and CAA Full-Year programs was 37 years old; in Summer the median staff member was 31 years old. For Full-Year programs CAAs had a small but significantly greater number of younger staff members (16-21 years old) while LEAs had significantly more older staff members (34 and above).

Racial/Ethnic Mix: CAAs employed a higher proportion of Negroes and a smaller proportion of Caucasians than did LEAs in both Full-Year and Summer programs. In each of the four major programs, the largest ethnic component of "all other" staff was Mexican Americans.

TABLE 20. RACIAL/ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF STAFF: PERCENT OF STAFF MEMBERS BY SELF-REPORTED ETHNIC GROUP

	Full-Year 1967-1968		Summer 1968	
	LEA	CAA	LEA	CAA
Caucasian (other than Mexican American or Puerto Rican)	50%	33%	46%	45%
Negro	26	46	30	39
All other	13	12	15	7

Status (paid/volunteer): Of those reporting, 88-90% of all Full-Year staff and 84-85% of all Summer staff were paid employees. A higher percentage of volunteers than paid personnel may, however, not have completed the questionnaire. There were no LEA/CAA differences on this item.

Hours Worked per Week: Of those reporting a larger proportion (about 50%) of Full-Year than Summer staff (about 25%) worked more than 33 hours per week. There was no reliable difference between LEAs and CAAs in overall distribution of hours worked per week.

Residence: Of those reporting, a significantly higher proportion of the CAA than the LEA staff members lived in the community in which they worked (73% vs 60% for Full-Year, and 76% vs 62% for Summer programs). Thus it would appear that CAAs may have done a better job in recruiting community members to serve as staff.

Length of Head Start Employment: Full-Year LEAs were more likely than CAAs to hire staff members with previous Head Start experience: 44% of the Full-Year LEA staff and 35% of the CAA staff has had more than one year of Head Start experience. There were no reliable CAA/LEA differences in previous Head Start experience for the Summer programs: 51-53% had had three months or less at time of report.

It is difficult to interpret these data without more information on local employment conditions. Full-Year CAAs may have had a greater turnover in staff members than did LEAs. If so, this might indicate that LEAs did a better job of training and upgrading their personnel, moving them from lower to higher positions within site. On the other hand, it is possible that LEAs were less likely than CAAs to make extensive recruitment efforts each year within the communities they served (thus reducing turnover due to mobility), or that CAA personnel moved from on-site positions to other jobs, possibly at the program level.

Attendance at Head Start Training Programs: Head Start programs are now required to offer pre-service and in-service training to all staff members. Until recently, the university-sponsored training sessions were intended mainly for teachers and teacher aides. While teachers and teacher aides comprised only 50% of all Full-Year staff, a mere 10% of all staff reported attendance at these right-week sessions. In contrast, a larger

proportion of Summer staff and significantly more CAA personnel, (43% vs 31% for LEA) attended one of the five-day university-sponsored pre-service training sessions intended for all Summer staff.

The percentage of staff members who reported attending in-service training activities was substantially higher although it is not clear whether each member participated in at least one type of activity or if about 35% of the staff did not attend any in-cervice activity. A reliably higher proportion of LEA staff members reported attendance at in-service lectures, movies, and demonstrations in Full-Year and Summer programs; at teaching guidance in Summer; and at university-based adult education courses in Full-Year programs. By these reports, CAAs tended to provide pre-service training to more staff members, while LEAs provided in-service training to more staff members.

TABLE 21. PERCENT OF STAFF MEMBERS WHO RECEIVED IN-SERVICE TRAINING

	Full-Year 1967-1968		Summer 1968	
	LEA	CAA	LEA	CAA
Lectures, movies, demonstrations on child level	65%	62%	48%	44%
Guidance on teaching preschoolers	49	49	29	23
Adult education courses at nearby University*	20	13	3	2

*Such courses were more accessible in winter than in summer.

Annual Family Income: CAA personnel reported considerably lower family incomes than did LEA staff members for both Full-Year and Summer programs.

TABLE 22. TOTAL FAMILY INCOME OF STAFF MEMBERS

	Full-Year 1967-1968		Summer 1968	
	LEA	CAA	LEA	CAA
$2,999 or less	16%	29%	19%	24%
$3,000-4,999	20	24	17	20
$5,000-7,999	23	20	22	23
$8,000 or more	36	20	30	23

For Full-Year programs, 27% of the LEA staff as compared with 13% of the CAA staff reported family incomes of over $10,000; this difference was not as great in Summer programs (21% vs 15%). Though these figures represent family, as opposed to Head Start staff member earnings, they do seem parallel to differences between LEA and CAA staff member status patterns. CAAs tend to employ more staff who are economically disadvantaged in terms of education, family income, residence in the Head Start (low income) neighborhood, and previous paid employment.

Foreign Language Proficiency: Significantly more CAA than LEA staff members (83% vs 77% in Full-Year programs, and 83% vs 76% in Summer programs) spoke only English, while considerably more LEA staff members reported both knowing and using Spanish with Head Start children (13% in Full-Year and 14% in Summer programs) than did CAA staff members (about 6%). A comparison of these figures with data on the number and distribution of English and for non-English speaking children at Centers indicates that, most probably, the majority of the non-English speaking children had regular contact with bi-lingual staff members. These data might indicate that, in compliance with the Policy Manual guidelines, both LEAs and CAAs attempted to recruit bi-lingual staff members where there was a need for them.

Previous Paid and Volunteer Experience Relevant to Head Start Employment: Fifteen to 30 percent of all staff members reported six or more months of prior paid and/or volunteer experience working with preschoolers, groups of low-income children, or with other low-income individuals and families. In all categories, LEA staff members had significantly more paid experience than did CAA personnel, while CAA staff members had significantly more voluntary experience with groups of low-income children and with low-income individuals and families.

Facilities: Virtually all Summer Head Start programs, both CAA and LEA operated, were located in schools; the majority (69%) of LEA operated and some (19%) CAA operated Full-Year programs were also located in schools. CAA operated Full-Year programs were more likely to be housed in churches or other neighborhood facilities.

- The location of the Center, both in terms of specific housing and general area (rural/urban) would be expected to have some impact on the facilities available. In general, however, there were fewer LEA/CAA differences than might be expected. Virtually all programs, Full-Year and Summer, LEA and CAA, reported having as much as or more than the minimum 35 square feet per child of indoor space and 75 square feet of outdoor space. The CAA Full-Year programs were less likely than the others to have a great deal more than the minimum; the LEA programs, both Full-Year and Summer, were likely to have a great deal more than the minimum indoor space. This may reflect the fact that the public school classrooms and playgrounds used by the LEA programs were likely to have been constructed to be used for a larger number of children than the church and other facilities used by CAA programs.

- Most Centers reported ground level outside play areas with sun and shade. More Summer than Full-Year programs reported open fields; more LEA than CAA programs were said to have fenced-in play space and more (48% vs 18%) reported the surface of the play area was blacktop. For the Full-Year programs, CAA children were more likely to have dirt or sand play surfaces available.

- In listing the equipment available, virtually all Centers (90% or more) reported having packing boxes and large play equipment, housekeeping equipment, dolls, fingerpaints, crayons and chalk, balls, toy cars, boats and trucks, puzzles, pegboards, and phonographs. Almost as frequent (80%-90%) were slides and jungle gyms, wheel toys such as bicycles, dramatic play clothes, puppets and musical instruments. About 60%-80% of the programs reported swings, sandboxes (which were not universal), pets, waterplay equipment, flash cards, tape recorders and movie or slide projectors. In general, the variety of standard equipment available suggests that most classes had some access to materials considered important for preschool development. The data do not indicate what additional materials were improvised by the teachers and parents nor the ways in which what was available might have been utilized.

- Comparison of CAA and LEA programs indicated that there were relatively few differences for equipment available, although CAA programs were more likely to report swings and other moving equipment (e.g., see-saws) while LEA programs were more likely to report equipment such as flash cards, tape recorders and movies and slide projectors. (For example, 62% of the LEA

Full-Year Centers reported use of tape recorders as contrasted to only 44% of the CAA operated Centers.) What differences there were indicated that more resources were available to the LEA Centers, but the differences were not as great as might have been expected on the basis of Center location.

In considering facilities in addition to classroom equipment, for the Summer programs, LEA operated Centers were more likely to have a parents' room and a first aid room while CAA operated Centers were more likely to report a kitchen. For the Full-Year programs, CAA Centers were more likely than LEA Centers to report a kitchen (81% vs 62%) and a parents' room (35% vs 28%). Since LEA programs were more likely to be housed in schools and to use school cafeterias, site characteristics rather than program policy may be reflected in these data. The higher proportion of parents' rooms available for Summer programs by the same line of reasoning may reflect the greater availability of space in the schools during the summer more than Center choice.

- Virtually all of the Centers reported books were available in the classroom. Relatively few programs reported books in a central location, for taking home, or other take-home equipment. More LEA (97%) than CAA (88%) Full-Year Centers reported books in the classroom; more CAA (60%) than LEA (49%) Summer Centers reported that a public library was nearby.

Curriculum: According to Head Start policy, Centers develop their own programs within general guidelines describing sound educational principles for young children. The label attached to the program is considered to be less important than the attitudes of the staff that encourage exploration, trust, and close interpersonal relationships, and

the breadth of experience that, with proper direction of the child's attention, can broaden the child's perspective and freedom in contacting this world. Questionnaires are not sensitive ways of indexing teacher attitudes such as belief in the child's potential for growth. The questionnaire did attempt to obtain some general indicators of program emphasis, which should be considered as general expressions rather than as solid information on classroom activities.

According to the Center Directors, environmental enrichment was the general descriptor most appropriate to the curricula; relatively few programs were described by other rubrics. The Summer programs showed few CAA/LEA differences, although CAA Directors tended to be slightly more likely to check descriptors such as structured drill and responsive environment. For the Full-Year programs, CAA Directors were more likely to describe the class as group day care and less likely to describe the classes as "responsive environment" and "environmental enrichment."

The curriculum emphasis, according to the Directors, was about evenly distributed in all areas but one. Over 75% of all classes were described as emphasizing sensory motor development, language development, social skills, concept development, self-esteem development and motivational development, while about 50% of all Directors reported one or more classes

with academic skills emphases.[1] There were no reliable LEA/CAA differences in these proportions, although LEA Full-Year programs tended to be more likely to report sensory motor, language, concept and self-esteem emphases.

This might suggest that the LEA operated Full-Year programs were more likely than CAA programs to have goals articulated in the language of the questionnaire. Some writers have suggested that pre-planned programs structured to develop such skills as language, basic mathematical and spatial concepts are more likely to enhance both cognitive and social-emotional development than programs with considerable peer interaction, enrichment through field trips, dramatic play, and in general, a less packaged pre-academic program. Studies now underway should provide more definitive information on this issue than is currently available. It is interesting in the context of these discussions to note that LEA operated Head Starts were not reported to be more stereotypically pre-academic and CAA Head Starts were not reported to be more stereotypically oriented to

---

1. The extent to which these might reflect what is actually happening in the classroom cannot be stated from available data. There is some suggestion, however, of a correspondence between these Center directors' reports and the reports of observers for another sample. For the 1967-68 national evaluation sample of full-year classes, observers who were frequently in the classroom were asked to rate program emphases. The observers found considerable evidence of activities likely to promote language development (74% of classes were rated as some or more), social development (83% some or more), concept development (76% some or more), and the development of self-esteem. Consistent with this survey of the Center Directors, training in academic skills (e.g., reading readiness, beginning arithmetic) were less likely to be observed as a strong program emphasis; 61% of all observed classes, however, had at least some activity directed to this end.

self-social development. Such differences as are found suggest rather greater LEA recognition of the classes in their programs in all of the list of articulated emphases and objectives; perhaps LEA Directors are more accustomed to labelling class curriculum emphases by these terms or the LEA teachers may have articulated these approaches and objectives more clearly than the CAA teachers. From some points of view, differentiation of the developmental status and appropriate goals for individual children and for the class is as central to child development as specific techniques. From another point of view, the list represents an educational establishment's point of view of significant approaches, and may be insensitive to other emphases (e.g., parent-school relationships) or innovative approaches that were not meaningfully described by the alternatives offered to the Center Directors. Further, probably site observational, studies would be needed to resolve this possibly central question.

Field Trips: According to the guidelines, "Field trips should be planned for the purpose of broadening the child's knowledge of his own immediate environment, broadening his cultural experiences and broadening his horizons about the world in which he lives." Most Center Directors

reported field trips which might be expected to broaden the child's knowledge of his immediate environment and his horizons about the world in which he lives; cultural events such as children's plays and musical productions, while less frequent, were reported by about 25% of all Centers. For the Summer programs, CAA Centers were more likely than LEA Centers to report visits to libraries, farms, industries, waterfronts, and visits from the community leaders and tradesmen to the Center. For the Full-Year programs, LEA Centers were more likely to report visits to museums, libraries and zoos. In general, the LEA Full-Year Centers appear to offer a greater variety of experiences through field trips than did the CAA operated Centers, while the most active programs of all four were the CAA operated Summer Head Starts.

Nutrition Program: According to the guidelines, a midmorning snack and a luncheon meal, preferably hot, are of great benefit to the child. A quiet, intimate setting with adults serving and eating with the children, such as the classroom which also may be expected to have tables and chairs of the right height, is preferred. The guidelines also recommend (a) that provision be made to provide instruction in the purchase and preparation of food, (b) that parents be engaged where possible as cooks and helpers, and (c) that a qualified nutritionist be responsible for determining the menus and supervising food preparation.

- While data are not available on all these criteria, the reports from the Center Directors indicate that about 20% of the children received a hot breakfast, about 75% a snack, almost 100% lunch and about 50% an afternoon snack. CAA operated Summer programs tended to be more likely to serve a hot lunch; CAA operated Full-Year programs tended to be more likely to

serve a hot breakfast, and LEA Centers, a hot snack.

- Cooks were most likely to be responsible for menu planning; however, almost as many of the Centers reported that a nutritionist (30%) or a nutritional consultant (30%) participated in menu planning. For both Summer and Full-Year programs, CAA Centers were more likely to report participation in menu-planning by the cooks. Since more Full-Year LEA programs used the school cafeteria, the 37% vs 49% difference in cook participation may indicate that school staff typically selected and prepared the children's food. However, for the Summer programs, about 62% of both LEA and CAA operated Centers reported eating in the cafeteria, and 52% vs 72%, respectively, reported cook participation in menu and food service planning. This may indicate a policy difference in the extent to which paraprofessionals were involved in making "professional" decisions, rather than housing-dictated convenience.
- In the majority of programs food was prepared on site. However, in both Full-Year and Summer programs, CAA operated Centers were more likely than LEA operated Centers to report on-site preparation (70% vs 58% and 83% vs 74% respectively).
- According to the Center Directors, more CAA than LEA Full-Year operated programs served food in the classes for the Full-Year programs; the majority of the Summer programs used school cafeterias.
- Most programs reported that children participated in setting the table and cleaning up. CAA Full-Year programs were more likely than LEA programs to report child participation in setting the table and in serving food. Thus the CAA and LEA programs were equally likely to involve the children in the clean-up chore while CAA programs were more likely to

provide an opportunity for children to participate in the nurturant aspects of food preparation and service.

The majority (about 75%) of all Centers provided child-size chairs and tables for meals. Whether child size or adult size, virtually every Center reported the teachers ate with the children. Some psychologists recently have stressed the importance for low-income children of meals and of this kind of meal-setting for both cognitive and affective development. It would appear from this sample that Head Start has long been providing what has currently been recommended.

Mobilizing Community Resources: According to the guidelines, "The success of Head Start in the long run depends on the support of the general community. Many agencies, organizations and associations have been providing services which are vital to Child Development Centers . . . [these] organization can and should provide services basic to the program. . . . Mobilization of community resources involves more than agencies and groups. Individuals count heavily as a community resource . . . journalist, lawyer, banker, advertising man, each has a contribution to make to the program. . . . Involve them all in Project Head Start."

According to the reports of Center directors, Head Start has reached out to communities, utilizing resources where available and enlisting the cooperation of organizations and individuals within the community.

- The majority (over 90%) of Centers are located in the neighborhoods from which the children come. Virtually all of the Summer programs were located in schools; about 70% of the LEA Full-Year programs were located in schools while about 53% of the CAA programs were quartered in churches or community Centers.

- Of the programs that were not operated by LEAs, the Summer CAAs reported extensive use of school services through use of buildings, offices and teachers. The Full-Year CAA programs, while less likely to use the schools' physical facilities, were equally likely to enlist the support of consultants from the school system, and also reported cooperation with teachers, administrative personnel and school program coordinators.
- Active community support of Head Start was reported by all programs. As might be expected, the Full-Year programs were reliably more likely to report active involvement from many community resources. For the Full-Year programs, LEA Centers seemed more likely to mobilize support in the form of speeches, coverage by TV and other media, participation by youth organizations, by community organizations, by professional organizations, and local businessmen. The differences were in some instances substantial, and may indicate greater community support for LEA operated programs, greater success in mobilization of these resources by LEAs, or, possibly, that the urban locations of the LEAs offered more opportunity to recruit such organizational support. There were no reliable LEA/CAA differences on this item for the Summer programs.
- Wherever possible, Head Start policy is to utilize available community resources rather than duplicating services. In general, the Centers were making full use of whatever was available. Of 26 listed agencies, nine were used by 75% or more of the summer LEAs,[1] 14 by 75% or more of the summer CAAs, 11 by 75% or more of the full-year LEAs, and 16 by 75% or more of the full-year CAAs: CAAs tended to be more likely than LEAs to report

---

1. The baseline here is (available and utilized) / (all available).

utilization of available community resources.

- Full-Year CAAs were particularly active in using existing agencies where available for family services and for work related training programs; for example, 82% of the Full-Year CAAs but only 68% of the Full-Year LEAs reported contacts (where available) with community job training programs. There were no instances in which proportionately more LEA Centers reported reliably greater utilization of existing agencies than did CAA Centers.
- Resources most heavily used (90% or more) by the Summer programs were public health clinics, group recreation facilities and nutritional consultants. The resources used where available by 90% or more of the Full-Year programs were medical laboratories, public health centers, group recreation centers, nutritional services and work training programs.
- Participation of individual members of the community has been regarded by Head Start as essential to developing a stable and effective program. According to the guidelines, "Every Head Start program must use volunteers to the fullest extent possible . . . College, high school and junior high school students make excellent volunteers. . . ." Without a survey of community resources, it is difficult to estimate the extent to which all available volunteers are being recruited; the information on breadth of volunteers' participation may offer some points of LEA/CAA comparison. As Table 23 shows, the breadth of recruitment was greater for Summer than for Full-Year volunteers, and greater within the community than outside. CAA Summer Head Starts were more likely to report recruiting college-age volunteers (25% vs 17%) and professional volunteers (41% vs 29%). For the Full-Year programs, CAAs were more likely to report participation by senior high school students and by professionals from the neighborhood.

TABLE 23. PERCENT OF CENTERS REPORTING ONE OR MORE VOLUNTEERS

Source	Full-Year 1967-1968		Summer 1968	
	LEA	CAA	LEA	CAA
Elementary School	20%	22%	43%	49%
Junior High School	13	16	69	65
Senior High School	23	32	59	66
College				
from Neighborhood	11	17	17	25
from Outside	16	20	17	17
Professionals				
from Neighborhood	17	28	29	41
from Outside	28	23	17	19
Voluntarily Unemployed				
from Neighborhood	57	55	45	48
from Outside	26	20	17	13

More voluntarily unemployed volunteers (housewives) were reported to have participated in the Full-Year programs than in the Summer programs, suggesting possibly greater availability of parents and housewives during the winter when other children may be in school than in the summer, when other children may be at home. Balancing this, the Summer programs recruit a substantially greater number of students. If there is a greater likelihood that the student volunteers will include young men than will the voluntarily unemployed volunteers, then it would appear that Summer programs offer greater opportunity for participation by men. According to the guidelines, "Men are particularly desirable as volunteers since so many of the children have a limited male influence in their lives."

- More Summer than Full-Year programs reported participation by older sibs and by Youth Corps workers. More Full-Year programs reported participation by community organizations. In the Summer programs, CAA operated Head Starts were more likely to report one or more Youth Corps volunteers, and volunteers from youth organizations, community organizations and professional

organizations. For the Full-Year programs, more CAAs were likely to report participation by one or more volunteers who were older sibs, VISTA volunteers, and Youth Corps volunteers.

- By these data, LEA programs seemed more likely to recruit organizational support through established agencies and programs, while CAA programs were more likely to find a broader base on support of individual commitment and were more likely to utilize community resources, particularly in the area of job training.

The Health Services Program: Children from low-income families often do not receive what is considered to be sound medical care. In summer 1965, over 50% of the children had not been examined by a physician during the previous year; over 50% had never been to a dentist. With routine examinations, incidence rates were found to be substantially higher for Head Start children than for economically privileged children. In response to this need, Head Start has directed much effort to providing comprehensive health services through the cooperation of the American Academy of Pediatrics.

According to the guidelines, "Every program must correct or alleviate all existing medical and dental problems and promote future health through immunizations, dental flouride treatment, health education of children and parents. . . ."

As more children have either attended previous Head Start programs, or are younger siblings of Head Start graduates, medical status at time of entering the program would be expected to improve. The percent who report having been seen by a physician or dentist has increased steadily over the past four years. This report will not present data for "experienced" and

"program new" children; the reader might, however, keep in mind that about 35% of the full-year and 42% of the summer sample children had previously attended Head Start.

The medical/dental questionnaire was usually completed by nurses, health aides, teachers and other personnel rather than physicians. In addition, the forms were distributed at the end of the program, so that record keeping would not have been likely to be responsive to the questionnaire requirements. Either the respondent was uncertain or no information was reported for about 5% to 25% of the children for almost all of the items. The complete percent of response to each item is reported in the tables in Appendix C. Since CAA and LEA Centers varied in the percent of "no information" responses from item to item for this section, the baseline for most comparisons excludes the "don't knows."

Immunization: At time of entering the sample program, less than half of the children for whom information was available had received full immunization for diptheria, pertussis and tetanus (DPT), poliomyletis, smallpox or measles. The children enrolled in full-year CAA operated programs were less likely than children enrolled in LEA programs to have received DPT, smallpox or measles shots; for the summer programs, children attending CAA operated Centers were more likely to have received DPT and less likely to be immunized against polio, smallpox or measles. By this index, the children attending CAA operated programs seem to have received less satisfactory health care prior to Head Start.

At the time of the medical report, about 75% of the children for whom data were available had received full immunization against DPT, polio, smallpox and measles. There were no reliable CAA/LEA differences for

summer or Full-Year programs on percent protected against these diseases at the time of the report. This suggests that the Summer programs were as effective as the Full-Year programs in providing this service, and that, as it were, the CAA physicians were providing more service in response to the greater need.

While it is encouraging that the majority of children for whom information is available were immunized against these diseases, less than 100% immunization seems less than satisfactory. About 25% of the children were not yet fully immunized against DPT, about 30% were not immunized against polio, about 25% were not immunized against measles, and about 35% had not received a smallpox inoculation. The medical report does not indicate why these children had not received this basic service; a further investigation would seem appropriate.

TABLE 24. INITIAL AND FINAL INOCULATION STATUS OF CHILDREN ATTENDING SUMMER AND FULL-YEAR CAA & LEA OPERATED HEAD STARTS: DPT, POLIO, SMALLPOX & MEASLES

Full immunization for	Full-Year 1967-1968		Summer 1968	
	LEA	CAA	LEA	CAA
Diptheria, pertussis, tetanus				
Initial status	61%	58%	68%	56%
At time of report	76	75	78	71
Polio				
Initial status	51	50	62	54
At time of report	70	68	70	68
Smallpox				
Initial status	48	39	49	44
At time of report	66	67	62	59
Measles				
Initial status	54	44	53	46
At time of report	79	74	70	72

Screening Tests: For about half of all children, screening tests for tuberculosis, anemia, hearing problems and visual problems were reported. The majority of children who were tested did not have positive responses. The following incidences were reported:

TABLE 25. SCREENING TESTS ADMINISTERED AND PERCENT OF ABNORMAL CONDITIONS REPORTED FOR CHILDREN ATTENDING LEA AND CAA FULL-YEAR AND SUMMER HEAD START PROGRAMS

	Full-Year 1967-1968		Summer 1968	
	LEA	CAA	LEA	CAA
Tuberculin				
Test administered	53%	56%	51%	58%
Positive response	2	2	2	2
Blood test for Anemia				
Test administered	48	53	57	65
Anemic condition	12	13	11	10
Hearing test				
Test administered	57	49	66	69
Abnormal response	6	4	5	5
Screening test for Vision				
Test administered	64	58	78	76
Abnormal response	8	11	9	9

While the incidence rates appear low as percents, in terms of children examined they indicate that about one child in 10 was anemic, that about one child in 11 had abnormal vision, about one child in 20 had abnormal hearing responses and about one child in 50 had a positive response to the tuberculin test.

Follow-up Treatment of Children with Abnormal Responses on the Screening Tests: According to the guidelines, "Merely examining children without ensuring that the medical and dental problems will be treated is a purposeless exercise. Plans which do not assure that each child will

receive all necessary treatment and preventive measures will not be funded." The medical examinations are given throughout the program and initiation of treatment may be scheduled after classes close and after the forms are returned: it might be expected that completion of screening, further examination and treatment would not be 100% completed by the end of the summer program and early spring (when the full-year data are collected).

As Table 26 shows, about 30% of the children were not yet evaluated or treated at the time of the report; the summer programs had somewhat higher percents of no action, particularly for the hearing and visual problems follow-up.

TABLE 26. FOLLOW-UP MEDICAL SERVICE FOR CHILDREN WITH ABNORMAL RESPONSE ON INITIAL SCREENING TESTS: SUMMER AND FULL-YEAR PROGRAMS OPERATED BY LEA AND CAA DELEGATE AGENCIES

		Full-Year 1967-1968		Summer 1968	
		LEA	CAA	LEA	CAA
Tuberculin test positive:	N=	30	38	48	32
Being screened		10%	3%	29%	60%
Treated		23	32	12	3
No treatment needed		44	55	29	32
Not evaluated or treated, NR		23	21	29	6
Anemia test abnormal:	N=	113	211	228	145
Being screened		13%	19%	25%	16%
Being treated		61	31	58	55
No treatment needed		12	26	10	14
Not evaluated or treated, NR		15	22	7	18
Hearing test abnormal:	N=	65	53	110	61
Being screened		43%	43%	38%	34%
Being treated		17	21	8	7
No treatment needed		20	9	21	3
Not evaluated or treated, NR		15	17	28	53
Vision test abnormal:	N=	102	138	218	127
Being treated		39%	32%	23%	19%
No treatment needed		30	38	19	16
Other		31	30	58	65

While virtually no children (less than 1%) were listed as "condition requires treatment but child is not being treated," for too many children there was no information, no evaluation reported or evaluations in progress to provide assurance that follow-up was satisfactory. There were few reliable LEA/CAA differences in treatment status for the four medical conditions considered, except for anemia: Summer LEA and CAA and Full-Year LEA programs reported that about 60% of the children who had abnormal responses on initial screening were being treated while about 12% were examined and found not to need treatment. For the Full-Year CAA programs, twice as many children were found not to need treatment, which meant only 31% were being treated for anemia.

Such comparisons as were possible indicated that CAA programs were somewhat more likely than LEA programs to report that recommended screening tests had been administered while LEA operated programs were somewhat more likely to record follow-up of actual (as contrasted to scheduled) examination and treatment of medical problems identified. While the sample sizes are small, and the percents accordingly less reliable than for other comparisons, the data suggest the need (a) to explore the reasons for the apparent delay in providing all medical services, from screening, through inoculations and further examination to treatment and (b) for a uniform data collection system to provide more reliable information on a facet of the program that has been given considerable prominence.

Dental Services: Most children (about 60% for full-year programs and 80% for summer programs) had received a dental examination at the time of the medical report. Of those examined, the majority had been seen by a dentist rather than a dental technician or a nurse. About 58% of the

children for whom information was available were found to have dental disease; over 96% of these children had dental caries. Of the children for whom dental problems were identified, the majority had had or were receiving recommended dental treatment. (See Table 27.)

TABLE 27. EXAMINATIONS GIVEN, CONDITIONS IDENTIFIED AND COURSE OF TREATMENT FOR CHILDREN ATTENDING SUMMER AND FULL-YEAR LEA AND CAA ADMINISTERED HEAD START PROGRAMS

		Full-Year 1967-1968		Summer 1968	
		LEA	CAA	LEA	CAA
Examination given		60%	62%	79%	79%
Dental disease found		54	57	63	54
Treatment given:	N=	1,027	1,195	1,921	998
In treatment		61%	58%	59%	69%
No facility available		5	3	3	7
Other reasons, no treatment		11	17	17	8
Unknown status		23	22	22	16

Of the children with known treatment status, about 80% were reported as receiving treatment or as having completed treatment. The LEA operated Full-Year programs were more likely to report treatment than were the CAA Full-Year programs (83% vs 74%); for the Summer programs, CAA operated Head Starts were more likely than LEA to report follow-up (82% vs 75%). There were no differences in percent of children of known status receiving treatment for Full-Year and Summer programs.

Prophylaxis: Reliably more children attending LEA than CAA programs for whom information was available routinely drink flouridated water (56% vs 40% for full-year and 48% vs 36% for summer). If the percent of children who had flouride applied to their teeth during the Head Start program is considered as a percent of children known not to

routinely drink flouridated water, then about 40% of the "eligible children" are reported to have flouride application. Slightly more LEA than CAA children received this treatment.

The dental program thus appears to identify a greater percent of treatable conditions than does the medical program. This is probably related to the fact that while relatively few children are reported never to have seen a physician, even in the recent programs, over 30% of the children had not previously been examined by a dentist. The known follow-up rate appears to be higher for dental than for medical conditions, particularly as compared to follow-up for hearing and visual problems.

The medical/dental data do not permit reliable comparisons of LEA/CAA operated programs. Fewer children were examined than might be expected and known follow-up was less than satisfactory. There is some evidence that this may reflect previously described problems in the medical records: the recent GAO report found higher rates than these Census data indicate of examination and of treatment for a sample of programs where the GAO personnel traced down the medical records. It would appear that a more systematic evaluation of the medical/dental program would be appropriate, given the proportion of the Head Start dollar that is expended on these services and the importance ascribed the medical/dental program.

Some preliminary data on the impact of CAA and LEA operated programs on children's development. In 1966-67 and 1967-68, a national assessment of the impact of Head Start on the children and their families

was undertaken through a network of University-based evaluation and research Centers.

These data are not as yet completely analyzed, although preliminary findings are reported in more detail elsewhere. The data at present afford comparison of the impact of CAA and LEA operated programs on the children's development as indexed by the Stanford-Binet IQ, the Preschool Inventory, and the Behavior Inventory. Report of these data should not be construed as Head Start endorsement of the Binet as the primary index of the impact of the program; analyses of the social-emotional data and of more detailed cognitive and perceptual-motor functions are not as yet available, and the Binet is simply presented as one among many other measures, one that happened to be analyzed more readily than the other, non-standardized measures and was available for two consecutive years.

As Table 28 shows, children in both CAA and LEA operated programs had higher scores when tested after about seven months in the program than at the time of initial testing which took place after about three months (1966-67) and two months (1967-68) of Head Start experience. The final levels (average IQ of 98) are close to the national average (100) on the test. Analyses of the data by week of Center operation at time of initial test show that the weeks 1-2 level for children without previous experience is about 86; the gain scores reported for the on-the-average late period of testing thus are likely to underestimate total improvement while the final level, which may be the criterion of most concern, is close to average.

TABLE 28. AVERAGE STANFORD-BINET IQ SCORES AT INITIAL AND FINAL TESTING FOR SAMPLES OF CHILDREN ATTENDING LEA AND CAA OPERATED HEAD START FULL-YEAR PROGRAMS IN 1966-1967 AND 1967-1968

		Binet IQ						
		Age at	Initial*		Final		Adjusted	Covariance F
	N	Initial Test	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	Ratio
1966-1967								
LEA	318	56 mos.	95.1	13.5	98.5	13.5	97.9	
CAA	437	60	93.1	14.8	97.8	15.6	98.5	1.15
1967-1968								
LEA	276	51 mos.	92.0	11.2	98.0	11.4	98.3	
CAA	988	53	92.6	13.0	97.1	12.7	97.0	4.86

*The 1966-67 children were initially tested after an average of three months in the program; final tests were administered on average of four months later, after the children had attended Head Start for seven months. The 1967-68 children were initially tested after an average of two months in the program; final tests were administered on average of six months later, after the children had attended Head Start for eight months.

- In both 1966-67 and 1967-68, there were no reliable LEA/CAA differences in the final IQ scores; analyses of covariance adjusting for initial level indicated a statistically reliable difference in favor of the LEA operated programs in 1967-68 but not in 1966-67. The absolute magnitude of the difference between the adjusted means is, however, less than one point; in general, the data do not indicate greater gains for children attending LEA operated programs on the Binet than for children attending CAA operated programs.
- The 1966-67 data have also been analyzed for the Preschool Inventory and for a teacher rating of children's classroom behavior. Both analyses indicated reliable initial-final gains on total scores and subscores; both analyses indicated no reliable main effects of LEA and CAA operated programs, except for greater gains reported by CAA teachers for the self confidence

and task orientation scales of the Behavior Inventory. Thus on the measures used, as analyzed to date, there is little evidence of greater gains for children attending LEA operated programs as contrasted to CAA operated programs. What differences there are suggest somewhat greater cognitive improvement for children attending LEA programs and somewhat greater changes for children attending CAA operated programs on the social development ratings; the magnitude of the differences is not, however, compelling evidence of a reliable difference in impact.